

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | Case No. 19cr10080-NMG-4 |
| v. |) | |
| |) | |
| GAMAL ABDELAZIZ, et al, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

**PARTIALLY ASSENTED TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A REPLY
UNDER SEAL TO DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION PAT HADEN'S
MOTION TO INTERVENE AND QUASH TRIAL SUBPOENA**

Pat Haden moves, by and through undersigned counsel, pursuant to Local Rules 7.1(b)(3) and 7.2, for leave to file a reply brief under seal in response to Defendant's Opposition to the Motion to Intervene and Quash Trial Subpoena issued to Pat Haden (Dkt. # 2117). The government assents to this motion. Defendants oppose the filing of a reply but agree that, if allowed, it should be filed under seal.

The Court should grant Mr. Haden's request. A reply, which counsel believes will be no longer than six pages, will assist the Court in deciding Mr. Haden's motion and is necessary to address the purported relevance of Mr. Haden's testimony that was proffered by defendants for the first time in their Opposition. Prior to that filing, defendants had not provided any specifics about the subject matter or purported relevance of Mr. Haden's testimony. As a result, Mr. Haden was not given the chance to address defendant's proffer or argument.

Even now that the defendants have provided some specifics, defendants have not accurately described what Mr. Haden's testimony on these subjects might be or their (lack of) connection to defendants. Additionally, the defendant's Opposition attached exhibits that were not in Mr. Haden's possession and therefore were not addressed in his initial motion.

Further, in responding to Mr. Haden's arguments on the burden the subpoena imposes, defendants provide new information. In order to address this new information, Mr. Haden respectfully asks that he be given an opportunity to file a reply under seal within twenty-four hours of an order granting this motion.

For these reasons, Mr. Haden requests the Court grant him leave to file the reply under seal because portions of the Opposition and a number of exhibits were filed under seal and the issues raised in the reply involve sensitive and personal information.

Dated: August 30, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ William J. Lovett
William J. Lovett (BBO No. 643525)
Lovett O'Brien LLP
One Beacon Street
Suite 1320
Boston, MA 02108

/s/ Brandon D. Fox
Brandon D. Fox (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
Jenner & Block LLP
633 West 5th Street
Suite 3600
Los Angeles, CA 90071

LOCAL RULE 7.1 CERTIFICATION

I, Brandon D. Fox, certify that I conferred with AUSA Stephen Frank, who assents to this motion. I further certify that I conferred with counsel for the defendants Gamal Abdelaziz and John Wilson, who do not assent to the motion's request for leave to file a reply. Should the Court grant Mr. Haden leave to file a reply, defendants assent to it being filed under seal.

/s/ Brandon D. Fox

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this document filed through the CM/ECF system will be sent electronically to the registered participants as identified on the NEF and paper copies will be sent to those indicated as non-registered participants on August 30, 2021.

/s/ Brandon D. Fox